UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

SECOND COMMITTEE
51st meeting
held on
Wednesday, 16 December 1992
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 51st MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. PIRIZ-BALLON	(Uruguay)
later:	Ms. DIOP (Vice-Chairman)	(Senegal)
later:	Mr. PIRIZ-BALLON (Chairman)	(Uruguay)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 78: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION (continued)

(a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 81: INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR THE ERADICATION OF POVERTY IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 79: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 80: PROTECTION OF GLOBAL CLIMATE FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS OF MANKIND (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 82: EXTERNAL DEBT CRISIS AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 83: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 89: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

DRAFT BIENNIAL PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR THE SECOND COMMITTEE FOR 1993-1994

COMPLETION OF THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-58275 6558S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/47/SR.51
7 January 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

1. Mr. AMMARIN (Jordan) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting it would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.2/47/L.29 and A/C.2/47/L.5.

2. Mrs. AMERASEKARE (Sri Lanka) said that, had her delegation been present during the voting, it, too, would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.2/47/L.29 and A/C.2/47/L.5.

3. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on products harmful to health and the environment (A/47/222-E/1992/57 and Corr.1); the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund on the United Nations Population Award (A/47/338), and the note by the Secretary-General submitting the report of the President of the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly on the outcome of consultations aimed at achieving an agreement on a code of conduct for transnational corporations (A/47/446).

4. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 78: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION (continued) (A/C.2/47/L.12, L.75, L.78, L.84 and L.89)

Draft resolutions on the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) (A/C.2/47/L.12 and L.75)

5. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines), introduced draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.75, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.12, and pointed out that the last two words "and women" of paragraph 2 (a) should be deleted. He recommended that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.

6. Miss KELLEY (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the statement on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.75 (A/C.2/47/L.89), said that the following sentence should be added at the end of paragraph 3: "The holding of the organizational session of the Preparatory Committee in New York or the substantive sessions of the Committee away from the established headquarters of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements, Habitat, would constitute an exception to the arrangements established by General Assembly resolution 40/243".

7. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.75, as orally amended, was adopted.

8. Mr. KARSLIOGLU (Turkey) said that his delegation welcomed the unanimous approval of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.75. Turkey was honoured that its offer to host the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements had been accepted, and would make all necessary arrangements to ensure its success.

9. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.12 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

10. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the work of its third special session (A/47/25), report of the Secretary-General on the further substantive follow-up of General Assembly resolutions 42/186 and 42/187 by Governments and organizations of the United Nations system (A/47/121-E/1992/15); the report of the Secretary-General on cooperation in fisheries in Africa (A/47/279-E/1992/79 and Corr.1); the report of the Secretary-General on structural change in the world economy: implications for energy use and air emissions (A/47/388); the report of the Secretary-General on combating drought and desertification (A/47/393); and the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the President of the Economic and Social Council on consideration by the Council of the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Commonwealth Group of Experts on the impact of global economic and political change on the development process (A/48/477).

11. It was so decided.

(a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/47/L.84)

Draft decision on programmes of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development for the Palestinian people

12. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document A/C.2/47/L.84, which reproduced the text of a draft resolution transmitted to the General Assembly by the President of the eighth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and announced that Afghanistan, Algeria, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Qatar, Sudan, Tunisia and Yemen had joined in sponsoring the draft decision.

13. Miss DIOP (Senegal), said that the informal consultations on the draft decision contained in document A/C.2/47/L.84 had failed to produce consensus.

14. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation would vote against the draft decision for the reasons it had set forth during the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.5. While Israel supported assistance efforts to the Palestinian people, it was firmly opposed to any cooperation with the Palestine Liberation Organization.

15. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft decision contained in document A/C.2/47/L.84.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of).

16. The draft decision contained in document A/C.2/47/L.84 was adopted by 133 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

17. Mr. CORNWALL (Australia) said that his country supported efforts to assist the development of the Palestinian people and had voted in favour of the decision, on the understanding that the reference to the occupied Palestinian territory applied only to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

18. Mr. BUKURU (Burundi) said that his delegation had wished to vote in favour of the draft decision but that, owing to a technical problem, its vote had not been recorded.

19. Mr. SABAH (Kuwait) and Mr. ORTIZ (Bolivia) said that, had they been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of the draft decision.

20. Mr. BAILLARGEON (Canada) said that, in view of the economic challenges faced by the Palestinian people, United Nations assistance was crucial for its development and Canada had therefore voted in favour of the decision. At the same time, his delegation deplored the increasing number of resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the Middle East, and he called upon all delegations to show greater restraint in that area.

AGENDA ITEM 81: INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR THE ERADICATION OF POVERTY IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued) (A/C.2/47/L.52, L.53, L.87 and L.88)

Draft resolution on the observance of an international day for the eradication of poverty (A/C.2/47/L.52 and L.87)

21. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.87, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.52, and recommended it for adoption without a vote.

22. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.87 was adopted without a vote.

23. Mr. MONGBE (Benin) said that the adoption of the resolution was proof of what had been stated in the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations that the peoples of the United Nations were "determined (...) to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom". It was clear that the activities to be carried out with a view to eliminating poverty should not be confined to one day alone since the elimination of poverty would be a long struggle.

24. Mr. MARTIN (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States, said that the European Community had joined the consensus on the resolution, because it attached great importance to efforts directed towards the eradication of poverty. A number of non-governmental organizations already commemorated 17 October as a world day to overcome extreme poverty. While the fact that the 17 October date had been the initiative of a non-governmental organization, the International Movement ATD Fourth World was now reflected in the revised draft resolution, the European Community and its member States regretted that the title selected for the day did not reflect more closely the aims and objectives of the day commemorated by the Fourth World Movement, which emphasized those experiencing extreme poverty. Naturally, efforts to eradicate poverty should be carried out throughout the year.

Draft resolutions on international cooperation for the eradication of poverty in developing countries (A/C.2/47/L.53 and L.88)

25. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines), introduced draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.88, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.53 and recommended its adoption without a vote.

26. Mr. MONGBE (Benin) said that paragraph 5 should read as follows:

> "Reiterates its request to the international community to adopt specific and effective measures designed to increase financial flows to developing countries, and urges developed countries which have reaffirmed their commitments to reach the accepted United Nations target of 0.7 per cent of gross national product for official development assistance, to the extent that they have not yet achieved a target, to agree to augment their aid programmes in order to reach that target as soon as possible, some countries having agreed to reach the target by the year 2000; other developed countries, in line with their support for reform efforts in developing countries, agree to make their best efforts to increase their level of official development assistance".

27. In paragraph 7, the words "continue to" should be inserted between "to" and "undertake" and the word "and", after "protect intellectual property rights", should be replaced by the phrase "as well as"; and in paragraph 10, the words "in all countries, particularly," should be inserted between the words "poverty" and "in developing countries". Furthermore, he said that there was considerable discrepancy between the French and English versions and stressed the need for the texts in the different languages to be brought strictly into line with one another.

28. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.88, as orally amended, was adopted.

29. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.53 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

30. Mr. HURLEY (United States of America) said that, the United States had joined the consensus on the resolution, since it believed that the alleviation, and ultimately the eradication, of poverty was a task to which all nations should urgently devote themselves.

31. Recognizing its obligations to foster an environment conducive to the creation of employment and wealth, the United States had sought to alter the language of the resolution, so as to reflect current realities and the broader economic interests of the international community. Poverty and unemployment were a blight in all countries, and not just the developing countries, and each country bore the ultimate responsibility for eradicating them within its own borders. In the view of the United States, international economic cooperation involved far more than United Nations assistance programmes, necessitating extensive economic interaction both among Governments and within the private sector, and with the end of the East-West divide, new ways should

(Mr. Hurley, United States)

be found of addressing economic problems, eschewing the stale rhetoric of the past and unproductive debates about resource transfers.

32. With reference to paragraph 5 of the resolution, he said that the United States had not set an official development assistance target, since such targets detracted from the more important issues of the effectiveness and quality of aid and the policies in the recipient country. It would continue to provide aid on a case-by-case basis, in a manner that encouraged reform efforts in developing countries. With regard to paragraph 7, the United States believed that technology which was subject to intellectual property rights should be transferred on freely negotiated and mutually agreed terms that recognized and were consistent with the adequate and effective protection of those rights.

33. Despite its conviction that sound economic policies, political stability, open trade, transparent investment and regulatory codes and technological exchange based on the strong protection of intellectual property rights were far more effective in the eradication of poverty than international assistance programmes, the United States still contributed more resources to official development assistance than any other country and led international relief efforts throughout the world.

34. In addition, the United States was endeavouring to revitalize its own economy, with consequent benefits for the developing world as well, since it absorbed more developing country exports than any other country and an economically weak United States could not maintain an open world trading regime and underwrite a stable financial system. For that reason, it had sought to have the words "in developing countries" deleted from the title of the resolution. Prevailing opinion, however, had held that the title could not be changed, since the resolution had had that title for a number of years; many of the other amendments it had suggested had been rejected for the same reason. His delegation regretted the Organization's apparent reluctance to consider new ideas, and believed that is was time for the General Assembly to change the terms of its debate in accordance with the changes in the world outside, so as to foster a more candid discussion of the real economic issues facing the world.

AGENDA ITEM 79: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/47/L.46, L.47, L.51, L.61, L.62, L.63, L.64 and L.90)

Draft resolution on the establishment of an intergovernmental negotiating committee for the elaboration of an international convention to combat desertification (A/C.2/47/L.46)

35. Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia) introduced the draft resolution, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations, and recommended it for adoption.

36. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the programme budget implications contained in document A/C.2/47/L.90 related to draft resolutions A/C.2/47/L.46, L.47 and L.61.

37. Mr. OULD EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania), supported by Mr. AHMIA (Algeria), pointed out that according to document A/C.2/47/L.90 the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on desertification to be established under draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.46 would receive less funding than the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for a Framework Convention on Climate Change. He appealed to the international community to make sure that the new body was funded as generously as possible, if need be from extrabudgetary resources.

38. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) asked for clarification from the Budget Division pointing out that delegations had been assured that the two Intergovernmental Negotiating Committees would receive the same level of funding.

39. Mr. KHAMIS (Budget Division), noting that the figures given for programme budget implications were consensus figures, arrived at after consultations with various substantive services, said that the discrepancy between the amounts allocated to the two Intergovernmental Negotiating Committees was more apparent than real. Although funds had been allocated for consultants and expert groups in the case of climate change only, in the case of desertification, a far larger amount had been allocated under the rubric of a Panel of experts. The number of posts established for each of the two secretariats had been calculated on exactly the same basis.

40. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.46 was adopted.

41. Mr. HAMMARSKJOLD (Sweden), expressing appreciation for the appointment of the Swedish ambassador as Chairman of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on desertification, said that he was convinced that the negotiating process would, with the cooperation of all, be successful.

42. Mr. MONGBE (Benin), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, welcomed the effective step that had just been taken to deal with the scourge of desertification, and thanked all who had helped to achieve that result.

Draft resolution on the convening of a global conference on the sustainable development of small island developing States (A/C.2/47/L.47)

43. Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia) introduced the draft resolution, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations, and recommended it for adoption by the Committee. He read out the following revisions to the text: in paragraph 7, the phrase "as well as representatives of relevant regional and subregional organizations" should be added to the end of the paragraph; in paragraph 8, the phrase "in paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 46/168" should be replaced by the phrase "in paragraph 7 above"; after paragraph 8, a new paragraph 8 bis should be added, to read as follows:

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

"Welcomes the candidature of Ambassador Penny Wensley (Australia) for the Chairmanship of the Preparatory Committee;"

in paragraph 9, the word "also" should be deleted from the beginning of the paragraph; and after paragraph 13, a new paragraph 13 bis should be added, to read as follows:

"Further requests the Secretary-General to prepare draft rules of procedure for the consideration of the Preparatory Committee at its organizational session, and in this context to include proposals for the participation of representatives of associate members of regional economic commissions, outside the negotiating process, and in accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, to allow them to contribute to the Conference and its preparatory process."

44. He noted that, on the basis of paragraph 7, all non-governmental organizations accredited to participate as observers in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development would be eligible to participate as observers in the Conference on the sustainable development of small island States, and that the Secretariat would be guided by paragraph 16 in inviting them.

45. Mr. ASHE (Antigua and Barbuda), referring to the estimated secretariat staff requirements for the preparations for the global conference (A/C.2/47/L.90, para. 48), asked whether the specified 12 work-months at the D-1 level represented the work of the senior official referred to in paragraph 12 of the draft resolution; and exactly when those 12 work-months would commence.

46. Mr. KHAMIS (Budget Division) said that the 24 work-months of Professional staff indicated in paragraph 48 of document A/C.2/47/L.90 had been intended only as a rough estimate of the total staff needed, bearing in mind that the preparatory secretariat for the global conference would be provided by the new department, to be established as announced by the Secretary-General. The posts required for the work on the conference would be drawn from the posts requested in the context of the institutional arrangements for the follow-up to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. The D-1 post specified was not meant to be that of the senior official mentioned, who would be chosen by the head of the new department once it was established. Revised estimates would be submitted early in 1993 for any new arrangements that had been made relating to the preparations for the global conference, taking into account the relationship established within the new department between the desertification secretariat and the climate change secretariat.

47. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.47, as orally revised, was adopted.

48. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados) observed that the global conference was a crucial first step in the elaboration of plans and programmes to support the sustainable development of small island developing States, as provided in chapter 17 G of Agenda 21. As part of the institutional arrangements for the follow-up to the Rio Conference, the Secretary-General should take early action to establish a clear international focal point, with adequate specialized inter-agency support, that would deal in a coordinated way with all the issues involved and build upon the considerable work already done at the national, subregional and regional levels. Barbados, as host to the Conference, looked forward to welcoming and working with all delegations to achieve success.

49. Ms. GLASPIE (United States of America) said that the United States welcomed the endorsement by the world community of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.47 and it looked forward to participating in the conference. The draft resolution set out a realistic timetable that would allow the participants to take into account developments in related conferences on land-based sources of marine pollution and integrated coastal-zone management.

50. In pursuing the objectives set out in chapter 17 G of Agenda 21, her Government was committed to maintaining the balance of interests related to the traditional uses of the oceans, such as freedom of navigation and the balance between the rights and obligations of coastal States reflected in the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Achievement of those objectives would require, among other things, integrated coastal-zone management, pollution-control strategies emphasizing pollution prevention, the further development of systematic monitoring of the oceans and marine ecosystems, and the elaboration of standards and procedures for data collection, management and exchange.

Draft resolution on the report of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (A/C.2/47/L.51)

51. Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia) introduced the draft resolution, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations, and recommended it for adoption by the Committee.

52. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.51 was adopted.

53. Ms. GLASPIE (United States of America) said that her Government's understanding of the results of UNCED was contained in volume IV, chapter IV.B (para. 6) of the report of the Rio Conference (A/CONF.151/26).

Draft resolution on institutional arrangements to follow up the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (A/C.2/47/L.61)

54. Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia) introduced the draft resolution, and recommended it for adoption by the Committee. He read out the following revisions to the text: in paragraph 9, the words "in Geneva and/or New York" should be added

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

at the end of the paragraph; and the chapeau of paragraph 32 on Secretariat support arrangements should be replaced with the following text:

> "Takes note of the decision of the Secretary-General to establish at the Under-Secretary-General level a new Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development and in this context calls upon the Secretary-General to establish a clearly identifiable, highly qualified and competent Secretariat support structure to provide support for the Commission on Sustainable Development, the Inter-Agency Committee on Sustainable Development and the High-Level Advisory Board, taking into account gender balance at all levels, the paramount importance of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity, and the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible in accordance with Articles 8 and 101 of the Charter of the United Nations and the following criteria;"

and paragraph 32 (c) should be replaced with the following text:

> "The Secretariat, which will be located in New York, should ensure easy access of all countries to its services; effective interaction with Secretariats of other international organizations, financial institutions and relevant conventions whose Secretariats have been established definitely or on an interim basis and should have a relevant office in Geneva to establish close links with activities related to follow-up of legal instruments, signed at or mandated by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and to liaise with agencies in the fields of environment and development. The Secretariat should also have a liaison office in Nairobi, on the basis of UNCED arrangements."

55. He noted that agreement had been reached on paragraph 9 on the understanding that informal consultations would continue to be conducted on the venue of the future sessions of the Commission on Sustainable Development, so that the issue could be decided at a resumed forty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

56. Mr. AMAZIANE (Morocco), referring to paragraph 32 of document A/C.2/47/L.90, asked why the date of August 1992 had been selected for the Commission's first substantive meeting. If the Commission were to meet at that time, it would not be able to report the results of its discussions to the Economic and Social Council as required under paragraph 18 of the draft resolution.

57. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) said that, as pointed out in paragraph 10 of the draft resolution, the Committee on Conferences could readjust the calendar of meetings as long as the forty-seventh General Assembly remained in session.

58. Mr. KHAMIS (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that August 1993 had been selected after a cursory review of the timetable of meetings. The Council remained free to revise the timetable at its first organizational meeting.

59. Mr. MONGBE (Benin) said that the issues with which the Commission would concern itself were too important to be treated in a casual manner. Questions concerning the scheduling of Commission meetings should be addressed through consultations with Member States and not left to the Secretariat alone.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that it was clear that many delegations shared the concern of Morocco regarding the scheduling of the Commission's meetings. Member States would be free to alter the timetable as they wished at the Council's first organizational meeting.

61. Mr. OULD EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) agreed that questions concerning the scheduling of meetings could be addressed more effectively at the first organizational meeting of the Council.

62. Ms. FREUDENSCHUSS-REICHL (Austria) endorsed the comments made by the other delegations with respect to the scheduling of meetings of the Commission and suggested that the Committee should return to the question of meeting schedules at another time.

63. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) suggested that the reference to August 1993 should be deleted and replaced by language to the effect that definitive decisions regarding the scheduling of meetings of the Commission would be taken by Member States at the first organizational meeting of the Economic and Social Council.

64. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.61, as orally revised, on the understanding that the suggested dates for meetings of the Commission on Sustainable Development would be subject to revision by Member States at the first organizational meeting of the Economic and Social Council.

65. It was so decided.

66. Mr. BARNETT (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States, said that Ambassador Razali of Malaysia deserved to be commended for bringing negotiations on the Commission on Sustainable Development to a successful conclusion. With regard to the location of the Commission, the view of the European Community and its member States was that the Commission should meet in Geneva. After 1993 the Commission should meet alternately in New York and in Geneva.

67. In order to ensure that the Commission carried out the functions assigned to it in an effective manner, the Commission should avoid the kinds of debate which had all too frequently characterized the work of other subsidiary bodies

(Mr. Barnett, United Kingdom)

of the Economic and Social Council in the past. Members of the Commission should consider carefully how to organize their work on the basis of the recommendations in paragraph 14 of resolution A/C.2/47/L.61, paying adequate attention to problems at the national level, which was where most of the responsibility for implementation of Agenda 21 resided.

68. At its organizational session in 1993, the Commission should adopt a coherent approach to the organization of its work programme. The best way to ensure such an approach would be to organize the substantive agenda in a series of segments, thereby establishing a rational and manageable scheme to enable the Commission to deal with a wide range of highly complex issues.

69. He welcomed the provision in the draft resolution for full participation of the European Economic Community (EEC) in the Commission's work and informed the Committee that the EEC would shortly be proposing amendments to the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council as they applied to the Commission in order to give full effect to those provisions.

70. The rights of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) should be reflected in the rules of procedure, and arrangements for their accreditation and participation should be spelled out in a decision to be adopted by the Council at its organizational session, since the Commission would not function effectively unless it had a strong and highly competent secretariat to back it up. The Community therefore welcomed the Secretary-General's decision to create a department of policy coordination and sustainable development in New York with the relevant office in Geneva. Although his delegation had not yet had sufficient time to study fully the statement of programme budget implications regarding the draft resolution, any concerns that it had in that regard would be raised in the Fifth Committee or in the General Assembly.

71. Mr. SHAUKAT (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that he would comment on the draft resolution at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly. He expressed the gratitude of all the members of the Group of 77 for the work of the Ambassador of Malaysia in conducting negotiations on the resolution.

72. Ms. FREUDENSCHUSS-REICHL (Austria) said that, given the vast mandate of Agenda 21, it would be imperative for the Commission to design an effective methodology for itself. In her Government's view, such a methodology should be based on a multi-year programme encompassing a series of themes for each year. Those themes should be communicated to the relevant entities of the United Nations proper, and to the specialized agencies, with the goals of the multi-year programme being taken fully into account. Furthermore, in order to function at a maximum level of efficiency, the Commission should have before it analytical reports of the highest quality regarding the three dimensions of sustainable development, namely, the social dimension, the economic dimension and the dimension relating to the natural resource base of the planet. To

(Ms. Freudenschuss-Reichl, Austria)

date there had been no single database integrating information on the dynamic interrelationships between society, economy and the environment. For that reason, her delegation had proposed the establishment of a system of unified and coordinated reports to serve as an empirical foundation for the Commission's work. Austria would pursue the implementation of its proposal in the appropriate fora.

73. Mr. HAMMARSKJOLD (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), said that the General Assembly's achievements in following up and implementing the commitments made during the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development bore witness to the sustained strength of the spirit of Rio and demonstrated the unique potential for cooperative endeavour within the United Nations system to tackle global issues of paramount importance to future generations.

74. In the view of the Nordic countries, the resolutions under agenda item 79 provided encouraging prospects for the further fulfilment of the shared commitments to sustainable development that had been undertaken at Rio. Of particular note in that regard were the decisions on the institutional arrangements for follow-up to the Conference in key areas relating to the Commission on Sustainable Development. The coming year would be a pivotal one for further elaboration of arrangements for review and implementation of the Rio commitments. In that connection it was essential that concrete progress should be made as soon as possible in the field of environment and development.

75. Mr. SUGANO (Japan) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the resolution. He agreed with the comment made by the representative of the United Kingdom regarding the need to resolve the question of meeting locations and expressed the hope that the General Assembly would take the matter up at a future resumed session. The position of his Government had been that decisions on the location of meetings should be guided by the principles set forth in paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 40/243.

76. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu) said that his delegation expected that the General Assembly's final decision on the venue of the meetings of the Commission on Sustainable Development would be in accordance with the normal practices and procedures of the United Nations as set out in Assembly resolution 40/243.

77. Mr. SCHIELE (United States of America) said that his delegation would comment on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution in the Fifth Committee, and would make a substantive comment on the draft resolution at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

78. Ms. YANG Yanyi (China) said that much work remained to be done before the Commission on Sustainable Development began its work, and her Government looked forward to cooperating with other Member States in the work of the Commission.

79. Mr. CORNWALL (Australia) said that his delegation would make a substantive statement on the draft resolution at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

80. Mr. ISAKOV (Russian Federation) said that agreement on the overall parameters of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development would make it possible to deal with questions relating to environment and development on the basis of a balanced and comprehensive approach, taking into account the implementation of the decisions of the Rio Conference at the international, national and regional levels.

81. Agreement on the holding of the Commission's sessions was of political importance to the Russian Federation, and his delegation hoped that further consultations on the matter would result in a compromise decision to hold sessions alternately in Geneva and in New York.

82. Mr. ARSLANIAN (Brazil), speaking on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, said that, while the negotiations conducted under the able guidance of the Permanent Representative of Malaysia had been difficult and intensive, the results that had been achieved were fully in keeping with the expectations of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development.

83. Mr. ORTIZ (Bolivia) endorsed the positive remarks about the representative of Malaysia that had been made by the representative of Pakistan on behalf of the Group of 77 and by Brazil on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group.

84. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.61 was one of the most important resolutions to be adopted by the Committee at its current session. The resolution would show world that the United Nations was determined to follow up the commitments of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development.

Draft resolution on a conference on straddling and highly migratory fish stocks (A/C.2/47/L.62)

85. Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia) introduced the draft resolution, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations, and recommended it for adoption by the Committee. He pointed out that in paragraph 4, line 3, the phrase "decision 46/469" should be replaced by the phrase "decisions 46/469 and 46/470". On the basis of paragraph 4, all non-governmental organizations accredited to participate as observers in UNCED would be eligible to participate as observers in the conference on straddling and highly migratory fish stocks, and that the Secretariat would be guided by paragraph 12 in inviting them.

86. Mr. BARNETT (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States, pointed out that paragraph 1 (b) of the statement of programme budget implications (A/C.2/47/L.85) would have to be amended in light of the minor oral amendment to paragraph 4.

(Mr. Barnett, United Kingdom)

87. The European Community was disappointed that it had not been possible to reach agreement on a fully satisfactory text, and would explain its position at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

88. Mr. GONZALEZ LINARES (Spain) said that the Spanish translation of "straddling fish stocks" was inaccurate, and suggested that it should be replaced by the definition contained in the title of article 63 of the Spanish text of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

89. Mr. SCHIELE (United States of America) said that it was important to establish a simple procedural framework for the intergovernmental conference on straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks. His delegation believed that the work and results of that conference should be fully consistent with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

90. Mr. KARSLIOGLU (Turkey) said that the fact that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.62 did not imply any change in Turkey's position with respect to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. While Turkey was not a party to that Convention, it attached great importance to the forthcoming intergovernmental conference on straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks.

Draft resolution on the observance of World Day for Water (A/C.2/47/L.63)

91. Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia) introduced the draft resolution, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations, and recommended it for adoption by the Committee.

92. Mr. AMAZIANE (Morocco) said that, in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the words "to be observed starting 1993", should be inserted after "World Day for Water,".

93. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.63, as orally amended, was adopted.

Draft resolution on capacity-building for Agenda 21 (A/C.2/47/L.64)

94. Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia) introduced the draft resolution, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations, and recommended it for adoption by the Committee.

95. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.64 was adopted.

96. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) said that, while his delegation welcomed the initiative of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to launch Capacity 21, it wished to make clear that the adoption of the draft resolution should be without prejudice to the discussions and deliberations by other organs established under chapter 37 of Agenda 21.

97. Mr. AMAZIANE (Morocco), speaking on behalf of the African Group, congratulated the representative of Malaysia on the successful outcome of the consultations he had conducted on the draft resolution.

The meeting was suspended at 7.05 p.m. and resumed at 7.10 p.m.

98. Miss Diop (Senegal), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 80: PROTECTION OF GLOBAL CLIMATE FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS OF MANKIND (continued) (A/C.2/47/L.38/Rev.1, L.58 and L.83)

Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.58

99. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines), introduced draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.58, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.38/Rev.1, and drew attention to the statement contained in document A/C.2/47/L.83.

100. He then drew attention to the following amendments: In the third line of the fifth preambular paragraph the words "are being" should be changed to "have been" and, everything in that paragraph after the word "Committee" in the fourth line should be deleted. In the second line of the sixth preambular paragraph the words "will be" should be replaced by "was". In paragraph 8, after the words "of the Convention", the word "including" should be substituted for the word "and", so that the phrase would read "including strengthening the capacities". Lastly, paragraph 18 should be redrafted as follows: "Decides that, subject to the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolutions 40/243 of 18 December 1985, 41/213 of 19 December 1986 and 42/211 of 21 December 1987, the costs of the work of the Committee and the interim secretariat should be funded within the current and forthcoming programme budgets, without adversely affecting the programmed activities of the United Nations, and through voluntary contributions to the trust fund, as appropriate". The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted without a vote.

101. Miss JANJUA (Pakistan) proposed that the phrase "bearing in mind decision 1/2 of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, inter alia," should be inserted in the fourth line of paragraph 15, after the words "developing countries".

102. Mr. EHLERS (Uruguay), supported by Mr. MONGBE (Benin), suggested that paragraph 7 should be amended, since the sixth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee had already been held.

103. After a discussion in which Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines), Mr. OULD EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania), Mr. BARNETT (United Kingdom), Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia), Mr. EHLERS (Uruguay), Mr. NIÑO GOMEZ (Venezuela), Mr. SCHIELE (United States), Mr. AMAZIANE (Morocco) and Mr. GAFOOR (Singapore) took part, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the meeting should be suspended to enable delegations to hold consultations.

The meeting was suspended at 7.50 p.m. and resumed at 8.55 p.m.

104. Mr. Piriz-Ballon (Uruguay) resumed the Chair.

105. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he would, in the name of his delegation, submit directly to the plenary Assembly a draft resolution which would take into account the various amendments proposed to draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.58.

106. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.38/Rev.1 was withdrawn by the sponsor.

AGENDA ITEM 82: EXTERNAL DEBT CRISIS AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolution on international debt crisis and development (A/C.2/47/L.16/Rev.1)

107. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.16/Rev.1 had no programme budget implications.

108. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines), reporting on the results of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.16/Rev.1, said that, regrettably, it would not be possible to adopt the draft resolution by consensus. He pointed out that the end of paragraph 6 should read "more urgent action with regard to the remaining commercial debt owed by developing countries", and that, in paragraph 10, line 4, the word "burden" should be in the plural.

109. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.16/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

110. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted by 109 votes to 1.

111. Mr. BARNETT (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Community, said that the draft resolution represented a reasonable compromise, although the text would have profited from a more comprehensive and faithful account of the fact that a large number of developing countries had benefited from a conjunction of debt reduction and a commitment to stabilization measures and structural reform programmes.

112. The European Community was firmly convinced that only the continued utilization of a case-by-case approach with regard to debt reduction would allow the remaining problems of excessive external indebtedness to be solved. In that context the Munich summit of the seven major industrialized countries had called for recognition of the special situation of some highly indebted countries on a case-by-case basis; the declaration adopted at Cartagena earlier in 1992 had also called for debt relief on a case-by-case basis for countries implementing sound economic reform programmes.

113. Miss JANJUA (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the Group of 77 had made strenuous efforts to promote a consensus on the draft resolution. Creditor countries must continue to help developing countries to deal with the problem of indebtedness, in particular through the promotion of economic growth and development.

114. Ms. YANG Yanyi (China) said that the external indebtedness of developing countries was an urgent problem and an obstacle to economic recovery and growth. The sponsors of the draft resolution had been flexible, and it was regrettable that no consensus had emerged. She hoped that the Organization would continue to play a role in resolving the problem of external indebtedness.

115. Miss GASTEAZORO (Nicaragua), Miss BELMAR BUSTAMANTE (Mexico), Miss ULLOA (Ecuador) and Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile) said that, had they been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.16/Rev.1.

AGENDA ITEM 83: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolutions on the triennial policy review of the operational activities of the United Nations development system (A/C.2/47/L.21, L.22 and L.92)

116. Miss DIOP (Senegal), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.92, which she was submitting on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolutions A/C.2/47/L.21 and L.22, and said that she trusted that it could be adopted without a vote.

117. Ms. KELLEY (Secretary of the Committee), after pointing out that paragraph 54 should be amended to read "the reports mentioned in paragraph 51, to be prepared", said that draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.92, if adopted by the General Assembly would have programme budget implications. Bearing in mind the complexity of the issues involved and the need for extensive consultations, the Secretary-General was not in a position at the current stage to report precisely on those implications. They would be reported to the Economic and Social Council at its substantive session of 1993, and subsequently to the General Assembly. In the meantime the Secretary-General would ensure that any additional resources that might be needed in order to initiate the implementation of the draft resolution in 1993 would be provided through internal redeployment.

118. Mr. RAADE (Netherlands) said that the first word of the first preambular paragraph should be replaced by "Recalling", and that the first line of paragraph 7 should read "the recipient Government has the primary responsibility".

119. Ms. DOWSETT (New Zealand), speaking on behalf of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, said that the three delegations would welcome the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. It reflected a reasonable compromise and should help to improve the efficiency of the United Nations development system at the field level.

120. Mr. BARNETT (United Kingdom) said that the fourth preambular paragraph, line 5, should be amended to read "... to increase substantially ...".

121. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.92, as orally amended, was adopted.

122. Draft resolutions A/C.2/47/L.21 and L.22 were withdrawn by the sponsors.

123. Mr. HURLEY (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his Government was committed to developing mechanisms for programme and financial review with the aim of strengthening field operations. In order to complete the reform process called for in General Assembly resolution 44/211, bold and innovative steps were necessary. While welcoming the positive elements contained in the draft resolution just adopted, his delegation believed that the resident coordinator system should be further strengthened. In particular, it favoured the separation of the post of resident coordinator from that of resident representative or country director of individual funds and specialized agencies as a first step towards better coordination. His delegation encouraged Member States to continue to explore ways to strengthen further the United Nations system in the field.

124. Mr. BARNETT (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States in explanation of position, said that the European Community welcomed the consensus, but would have liked the resolution to go further in certain areas. The country strategy note would be an important tool in providing a more integrated and effective response to the

(Mr. Barnett, United Kingdom)

needs of developing countries, and it hoped that such countries would find formulation of a note to their advantage. Agreement had not yet been reached on ways to separate the post of resident coordinator from that of resident representative or country director of a fund or programme. The European Community continued to believe in the importance of such a separation. It also hoped for a more flexible interpretation of the principle that the UNDP resident representative should normally be the resident coordinator.

125. Miss JANJUA (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 in explanation of position, said that the needs of developing countries had increased largely due to the inequities of the world economic system. Therefore, the triennial policy review had stressed the need for a substantial increase in resources for operational activities for development commensurate with the increasing needs of developing countries. The review also established the country strategy note, in the context of the recipient Government's primary responsibility for coordinating, on the basis of national strategies and priorities, all types of external assistance. Interested Governments would formulate a strategy note, and the United Nations system would assist only if called upon to do so.

126. The functions of the resident coordinator must be strengthened without creating an additional bureaucratic layer. The Committee had decided to maintain the status quo as laid down in General Assembly resolution 34/213, paragraph 3, in other words resident representative would normally be designated as resident coordinator. However, in order to ensure that they were qualified, the pool of qualified development professionals eligible for appointment as UNDP resident representative/resident coordinator had been broadened (para. 40 (d)). The resolution did not in any way accept the separation of the functions of the resident representative and country director.

127. Ms. YANG Yanyi (China) said that her delegation also welcomed the consensus on the resolution, and shared the views expressed by the Group of 77 on the country strategy notes and enhancement of the resident coordinator system.

128. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the Note of the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme on the operation, management and budget of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (A/47/340).

129. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 89: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

Draft resolutions on the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (A/C.2/47/L.60/Rev.1, L.81, L.91 and L.94)

130. Miss DIOP (Senegal), introduced draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.91, which she was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on revised draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.60/Rev.1, and pointed out that the word "relevant" should be inserted before "national" in the second line of the sixth preambular paragraph. The statements on programme budget implications of the two draft resolutions were contained in documents A/C.2/47/L.94 and L.81 respectively.

131. Mr. OULD EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) said that his delegation also wished to sponsor the draft resolution.

132. Miss JANJUA (Pakistan) said that, with regard to paragraph 2, it was her understanding that the reference to "senior fellows" was in accordance with article 6, paragraphs 6.1 and 6.5 of the statute of UNITAR. Even if the Institute headquarters were to move to Geneva, the statutes would prevail since the senior fellows and the liaison office would remain in New York.

133. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.91, as orally revised, was adopted.

134. Mrs. HELKE (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States in explanation of position, said that the European Community shared the view of the Secretary-General that the situation of UNITAR could not be allowed to continue. Although the draft resolution was unsatisfactory in several respects, it would enable the Secretary-General to carry out much-needed reforms. Those reforms should allow UNITAR, with its new headquarters in Geneva, the chance of a fresh start to attract the necessary funds for a worthwhile programme of training activities and cooperation with the ILO training centre in Turin, while allowing the training programmes in New York to continue.

135. The European Community was concerned about the financial implications of the draft resolution which were, in part, the result of past mistakes that should not be compounded. That proposal should receive close attention by ACABQ and the Fifth Committee.

136. Draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.60/Rev.1 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

DRAFT BIENNIAL PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR THE SECOND COMMITTEE FOR 1993-1994 (A/C.2/47/L.80)

137. Ms. KELLEY (Secretary of the Committee) said that, as noted in document A/C.2/47/L.80, in view of intense negotiations currently being held in the working group of the plenary restructuring, it might be preferable to defer preparation of a draft biennial programme of work, so that the working group's conclusions might be taken into consideration.

138. The CHAIRMAN said that he would take it that the Committee wished to defer further consideration of its draft biennial programme of work as proposed in document A/C.2/47/L.80.

139. It was so decided.

COMPLETION OF THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

140. After an exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee had completed its work for the forty-seventh session.

The meeting rose at 10.25 p.m.